

Serial No. 09/911,155
Am dt. Dated August 25, 2003
Reply to Restriction Requirement of July 11, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The examiner noted a point of confusion regarding the wording of claim 14 and it has been amended to address the confusion.

The examiner also noted a lack of antecedent basis for the term "omnidirectional" in claim 37, in reference to the light emitted by the active layers. This claim has been amended to remove this term.


The examiner also noted an insufficient antecedent basis for "said UV light" in claim 42 and this claim has been amended to change this term to "said active layer light".

The examiner's comments regarding claims 39 and 40 have been noted and applicants are gathering the necessary information to address the examiner's questions and the information will be presented by preliminary amendment or through further prosecution.

Claim 15 has been amended to correctly depend from claim 14.

All of the claims are believed to be in a proper form for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jave G. Heybl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,661

August 25, 2003

KOPPEL JACOBS PATRICK & HEYBL
555 St. Charles Drive, Suite #107
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
(805) 373-0060